



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/501,949

07/21/2004

Gad Talmon

014787.0005

8436

60/707

7590

05/01/2009

SPILMAN THOMAS & BATTLE PLLC

C/O CPA Global

P.O. BOX 52050

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

TORRENTE, RICHARD T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/01/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/501,949

**Applicant(s)**

TALMON ET AL.

**Examiner**

RICHARD TORRENTE

**Art Unit**

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-27, 30-47 and 49-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-27, 30-47 and 49-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13-23, 26, 27, 30-47 and 49-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer et al. (NPL: A New System for Video-Based Detection of Moving Objects and its Integration into Digital Networks, 1996, hereinafter "Meyer") (IDS) in view of Lipton et al. (US 2005/0146605) for the same reason as the last office action dated 12/15/08.

Regarding newly amended claims 1, 15, 32 and 46 of replacing the "object" with "areas", the claims are rejected for the same reason as the last office action dated 12/15/08.

3. Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer et al. (NPL A New System for Video-Based Detection of Moving Objects and its Integration into Digital Networks, hereinafter "Meyer") (IDS) in view of Lipton et al. (US 2005/0146605), and further in view of Wang et al. (US PN 6,266,369 B1) for the same reason as the last office action dated 12/15/08.

4. Claims 12 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer et al. (NPL A New System for Video-Based Detection of Moving Objects and its Integration into Digital Networks, hereinafter "Meyer") (IDS) in view of Lipton et al. (US 2005/0146605), and further in view of Seeley et al (US PN 6,069,655) for the same reason as the last office action dated 12/15/08.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 3/5/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 15, 32 and 46, Applicants argued that Lipton "video primitives" does not align with "feature extraction" process and "extract event occurrences". Applicant's argument is noted, however, the primary reference Meyer already teaches detecting said event from analyzing said features stream. There is no requirement that the secondary reference Lipton further teaches detecting said event from analyzing said features stream because detecting said event from analyzing said features stream was already taught by the primary reference. The secondary reference merely teaches the deficiency of the primary reference. The deficiency of the Meyer is that the processing is performed at the camera coder. Lipton teaches a well known in the art practice of processing a received data (primitives/features) at a server. The secondary reference does not provide any teaching that destroys the interrelated purpose of the primary reference. Therefore, the Examiner maintains the limitations are met.

***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **RICHARD TORRENTE** whose telephone number is (571) 270-3702. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Richard Torrente/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Young Lee/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621

RT